

1 JENNIFER HARTMAN KING (SBN 211313)  
2 ALANNA LUNGREN (SBN 269668)  
3 J. R. PARKER (SBN 320526)  
4 ANDREYA WOO NAZAL (SBN 327651)  
5 HARTMAN KING PC  
6 520 Capitol Mall, Suite 750  
7 Sacramento, CA 95814  
Telephone: (916) 379-7530  
Facsimile: (916) 379-7535  
JHartmanKing@HartmanKingLaw.com  
ALungren@HartmanKingLaw.com  
JRParker@HartmanKingLaw.com  
AWooNazal@HartmanKingLaw.com

Exempt From Filing Fees Pursuant  
To Government Code Section 6103

8 Attorneys for Defendants KATHLEEN ALLISON,  
9 in her official capacity as Secretary of the California Department  
of Corrections and Rehabilitation; and PATRICK COVELLO,  
10 in his official capacity as Warden of California Department of  
Corrections and Rehabilitation Mule Creek State Prison

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

12 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 CALIFORNIA SPORTFISHING  
14 PROTECTION ALLIANCE,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 KATHLEEN ALLISON, in her official  
capacity as Secretary of the California  
18 Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation,

19 Defendant.

20 COUNTY OF AMADOR, *a public agency of*  
*the State of California,*

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 KATHLEEN ALLISON, in her official  
capacity as Secretary of the California  
24 Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation;  
and PATRICK COVELLO, in his official  
25 capacity as Warden of California Department  
of Corrections and Rehabilitation Mule Creek  
State Prison,

26 Defendants.

13 Case No. 2:20-CV-02482-WBS-AC  
[consolidated with 2:21-CV-00038-WBS-AC]

**DEFENDANTS' EX PARTE  
APPLICATION FOR ORDER  
MODIFYING BRIEFING SCHEDULE  
FOR PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY ADJUDICATION;  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF**

**NO ORAL ARGUMENT UNLESS  
REQUESTED BY THE COURT**

Judge: Hon. William B. Shubb  
Ctrm. 5

(Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33  
U.S.C. §§ 1251 to 1387)

Final Pretrial Conf.: February 13, 2023  
Trial Setting Conf.: April 18, 2023

28 00053217.1

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendants KATHLEEN ALLISON, in her official  
3 capacity as Secretary of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation; and  
4 PATRICK COVELLO, in his official capacity as Warden of California Department of  
5 Corrections and Rehabilitation, Mule Creek State Prison (“Defendants”) hereby move *ex parte*  
6 for a modification to the briefing schedule of Plaintiffs’ CALIFORNIA SPORTFISHING  
7 PROTECTION ALLIANCE and COUNTY OF AMADOR (“Plaintiffs”) Motion for Summary  
8 Adjudication (“MSA” or “Plaintiffs’ MSA”). Defendants do not seek oral argument on this  
9 application unless requested by the Court.

10 This application is made pursuant to Federal Rule Civil Procedure 6(b) and Eastern District  
11 Local Rule 144(c). This Court has the authority to extend the time within which Defendants must  
12 respond to Plaintiffs’ MSA. Eastern District Local Rule 144(c) specifically provides that the Court  
13 may, in its discretion, grant an initial extension *ex parte* upon the affidavit of counsel that a  
14 stipulation extending time cannot reasonably be obtained, explaining the reasons why such a  
15 stipulation cannot be obtained and the reasons why the extension is necessary. This application is  
16 based upon the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Jennifer  
17 Hartman King, the [Proposed] Order, the Court’s file in this action, and any oral argument presented  
18 by Defendants at the Court’s request.

19 Dated: July 1, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

20 HARTMAN KING PC

21 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
22

JENNIFER HARTMAN KING

ALANNA LUNGREN

J.R. PARKER

ANDREYA WOO NAZAL

23 Attorneys for Defendants

24 KATHLEEN ALLISON in her capacity as  
25 Secretary of THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT  
26 OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION;  
27 and PATRICK COVELLO, in his official capacity  
as Warden of California Department of Corrections  
and Rehabilitation Mule Creek State Prison

1                           **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2                           **I. INTRODUCTION**

3                           Defendants seek modification to the briefing schedule of Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary  
4                           Adjudication ("MSA") that is set for hearing on August 22, 2022. Plaintiffs served their MSA  
5                           shortly before the close of business on June 28, 2022. Based on the MSA's service date,  
6                           currently, Defendants' Opposition to the MSA is due July 12, 2022. Plaintiffs' Reply is due July  
7                           22, 2022.

8                           Defendants seek to extend the deadline by which to file their Opposition from July 12,  
9                           2022, to and including **August 1, 2022**. Plaintiffs' Reply brief would then be due **August 11,**  
10                          **2022**. The requested modified briefing schedule affords the Plaintiffs and the Court the same  
11                          amount of time they would have had if Plaintiffs served their MSA on July 18, 2022, a service  
12                          date that complies with the noticed motion requirements under the Federal Rules of Civil  
13                          Procedure ("Fed. R. Civ. P.") 6(c) and Eastern District Local Rule 230(b) for a hearing on August  
14                          22, 2022.

15                           **B. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

16                           Defendants' requested modification of the deadline by which to file their Opposition to  
17                           Plaintiffs' MSA is necessary for numerous reasons, including: (1) the lengthy nature of  
18                           Plaintiffs' MSA and the significant volume of materials served concurrently with the MSA; (2)  
19                           the complex nature of this case; (3) the timing of the MSA filing—just prior to an extended  
20                          national holiday weekend—which atypically and prejudicially truncates Defendants' response  
21                          time; (4) the pre-planned absence of a senior firm attorney, who is currently out of state on  
22                          vacation; (5) the unexpected illnesses and absences of multiple other firm attorneys—including  
23                          the Lead Attorney on this matter—has negatively impacted defense counsel's collective  
24                          capacity; (6) it is not possible for Defendants to prepare all the required supporting materials in  
25                          advance of the current deadline due to circumstances beyond their control; (7) Defendants sought  
26                          but were unable to obtain from Plaintiffs a stipulation to Defendants' requested extension of the  
27                          deadline to file their Opposition to Plaintiffs' MSA; (8) Defendants' request to modify the

1 briefing schedule of Plaintiffs' MSA cannot be noticed on the Court's motion calendar pursuant  
2 to Local Rule 230; and (9) numerous other competing client commitments.

3 The parties are in the throes of expert discovery, with expert reports due on August 1,  
4 2022. Further, Plaintiffs noticed the deposition of Secretary Allison's Federal Rule of Civil  
5 Procedure 30(b)(6) designee for August 11, 16, and 19, 2022. When the parties met and  
6 conferred regarding these deposition dates, Plaintiffs did not disclose to Defendants their plan to  
7 file a significant dispositive motion while Defendants would be preparing multiple witnesses for  
8 deposition and preparing their expert disclosures and reports. Plaintiffs also did not offer the  
9 professional courtesy to Defendants' counsel of conferring before selecting the August 22, 2022,  
10 hearing date and serving the MSA, thereby generating the current problematic briefing schedule.  
11 Had Plaintiffs offered this professional courtesy, the parties could have coordinated on mutually  
12 agreeable briefing deadlines for Plaintiffs' MSA, avoiding Defendants' need to seek  
13 modification of the briefing schedule via the instant *ex parte* application.

14 On June 30, 2022, Defendants informed Plaintiffs that Defendants needed an extension to  
15 the deadline to file their Opposition to Plaintiffs' MSA to and including August 1, 2022. In  
16 requesting Plaintiffs to stipulate to this requested extension, Defendants shared numerous bases  
17 supporting good cause for their needed extension, including the following: (1) the lengthy nature  
18 of Plaintiffs' MSA and the significant volume of materials served concurrently with the MSA;  
19 (2) the complex nature of this case; (3) the timing of the MSA filing—just prior to a national  
20 holiday weekend—which atypically and prejudicially truncates Defendants' response time; (4)  
21 the pre-planned absence of a senior firm attorney, who is currently out of state on vacation; (5)  
22 the unexpected illnesses and absences of multiple other firm attorneys—including the Lead  
23 Attorney on this matter—which has negatively impacted defense counsel's collective capacity;  
24 and (6) numerous other competing client commitments. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶10).

25 Based upon the reasons expressed above, Defendants requested Plaintiffs stipulate to an  
26 extension of Defendants' deadline to file the Opposition Brief to Plaintiffs' MSA, up to and  
27 including August 1, 2022. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶10). Defendants also informed Plaintiffs  
28 that, if Plaintiffs would not agree to the requested stipulation, Defendants would have no  
00053217.1

1 alternative but to seek *ex parte* relief from the Court, which they would seek via this application.  
 2 (Hartman King Decl. at ¶10). Although Plaintiffs' unilateral decisions played a significant role in  
 3 creating the scheduling issues necessitating this *ex parte* application, Plaintiffs refused to  
 4 stipulate to Defendants' request to extend the Opposition deadline to August 1. Instead, Plaintiffs  
 5 offered only to extend Defendants' Opposition deadline to July 22—ten days less than  
 6 requested—and demanded to shift that time to Plaintiffs, thereby doubling the amount of time  
 7 otherwise allowed to file their Reply. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶11). In the face of all the good  
 8 cause bases for Defendants expressed need to extend the opposition deadline to August 1,  
 9 Plaintiffs provided no rationale for declining to stipulate to the Defendants' proposed August 1  
 10 deadline to file their Opposition and presented no good cause for Plaintiffs' demand to double  
 11 the amount of time otherwise allowed to file their Reply (Hartman King Decl. at ¶11).  
 12 Defendants inquired, but Plaintiffs did not indicate, whether or not Plaintiffs would oppose  
 13 Defendants' *ex parte* application. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶11).

## 14 II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

### 15 A. The Court Has Power To Extend The Briefing Schedule For Plaintiffs' MSA

16 Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, "...[w]hen an act may or must be done  
 17 within a specified time..." a court may, for good cause, with or without a motion or notice,  
 18 extend the time within which a party must do said act—provided the court acts, or the request is  
 19 made, before the original time to act, or its extension, expires. (Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1);  
 20 *Yellowcake, Inc. v. Dashgo, Inc.* (E.D. Cal. 2022) 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 49173, at \*4-5).  
 21 Furthermore, Eastern District Local Rule 144 states:

22 The Court may, in its discretion, grant an initial extension *ex parte* upon the  
 23 affidavit of counsel that a stipulation extending time cannot reasonably be  
 24 obtained, explaining the reasons why such a stipulation cannot be obtained and  
 25 the reasons why the extension is necessary. Except for one such initial extension,  
*ex parte* applications for extension of time are not ordinarily granted.

26 (L.R. 144(c)). "Indeed, requests for extension of time made before the deadline has passed  
 27 normally should be and usually are granted absent of bad faith [sic] or prejudice to the adverse  
 28

1 party.” (Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1); *Franklin v. United States* (E.D. Cal. 2013) 2013 U.S. Dist.  
2 LEXIS 27863, at \*3). Situations where an important deadline would pass prior to a motion being  
3 heard on a regularly-scheduled notice meet the requirements of Local Rule 144(c). (See, e.g.,  
4 *Espinoza v. Cal. Highway Patrol* (E.D. Cal. 2017) 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 212780, \*3-4 (motion  
5 shortening time granted where motion to extend discovery deadlines would be heard on January  
6 18, 2018, but deadline to file dispositive motions was January 12, 2018; *Wilson v. Conair Corp.*  
7 (E.D. Cal. 2016) 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9806, \*2-4 (court shortened time to hear motion to  
8 amend complaint where the statute of limitations would run on the claim prior to the regularly-  
9 scheduled hearing date). Thus, this Court has the power to extend the briefing schedule for  
10 Plaintiffs’ MSA.

11 **B. Good Cause Supports Defendants’ Request To Extend The Deadline To File Their**  
12 **Opposition To Plaintiffs’ MSA**

13 In this case, modification to the briefing schedule of Plaintiffs’ MSA is necessary for  
14 numerous reasons, each of which is more fully articulated below. Defendants seek this  
15 modification in good faith, and a granted extension for Defendants to file their Opposition by  
16 August 1 will not prejudice Plaintiffs.

17 First, the modification is necessary due to both the lengthy nature of Plaintiffs’ MSA and  
18 the significant volume of materials served concurrently with the MSA. On June 28, 2022—at  
19 approximately 4:34 p.m.—Plaintiffs filed and served their MSA and supporting documents.  
20 (Hartman King Decl. at ¶3). These materials included (1) a 38-page brief; (2) eight declarations;  
21 (3) the allegation of 47 separate undisputed facts; and (4) nine hundred sixty-three (963) pages of  
22 exhibits. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶3). The hearing is scheduled for August 22, 2022, and the  
23 moving papers were served 55 days prior to the hearing date. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶3).  
24 Plaintiffs chose the August 22 hearing date without conferring with Defendants, and then filed  
25 the MSA setting a briefing schedule, also without conferring with Defendants. The parties are  
26 currently in the throes of preparing for depositions scheduled for August and preparing expert  
27 reports that will be disclosed on August 1. This, combined with the additional reasons  
28

1 necessitating modification expressed herein, and the depth and breadth of material which  
 2 Defendants' must review and respond to, provide good cause for the requested modification.

3 Second, the modification is necessary due to the complex nature of this case. Plaintiffs  
 4 bring this consolidated citizen suit enforcement action under Section 505 of the Clean Water Act,  
 5 33 U.S.C. section 1365, alleging numerous violations of the Clean Water Act at Mule Creek  
 6 State Prison—an 866-acre prison complex housing approximately 4,000 inmates and employing  
 7 1,400 staff, located in Ione, California. Defendants own and operate Mule Creek State Prison.  
 8 Mule Creek bisects the prison complex. In addition to the complexities which are typical of  
 9 Clean Water Act citizen suit enforcement actions, generally, this case carries with it myriad  
 10 additional layers of complexity due to its unique setting, facts, and Plaintiffs' claims. Combined  
 11 with the additional reasons necessitating modification expressed herein, the complex nature of  
 12 this case provides good cause for the requested modification. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶ 2).

13 Third, the modification is necessary due to the timing of the MSA filing—just prior to an  
 14 extended national holiday weekend. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶4). As stated above, Plaintiffs'  
 15 MSA was filed and served on June 28, 2022—at approximately 4:34 p.m.—three business days  
 16 prior to an extended national holiday weekend (i.e., American Independence Day). (Hartman  
 17 King Decl. at ¶4). All of our attorneys who are not otherwise out of the office due to planned  
 18 vacations or sickness—discussed further below—made plans to remain out of the office in  
 19 observance of the Fourth of July, long before Plaintiffs filed and served the MSA. (Hartman  
 20 King Decl. at ¶4). Whether intentional or benign, the timing of Plaintiffs' filing and service of  
 21 the MSA on the cusp of an important holiday weekend—during which most either observe  
 22 Independence Day with family and friends or take long-planned summer vacations—atypically  
 23 and prejudicially truncates the time Defendants have to respond to the MSA.<sup>2</sup> Combined with the  
 24

---

25 <sup>2</sup> Notably, on Friday, July 1, 2022, at approximately 3:46 p.m., and following Defendants' request based on good  
 26 cause that Plaintiffs stipulate to extend Defendants' deadline to file the Opposition to the MSA, Plaintiffs served a  
 27 Joint Notice of Deposition and Deposition Subpoenas on five Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
 28 employees. Plaintiffs noticed five depositions for July 27, July 28, July 29, August 1 and August 2, 2022, after  
 receiving notice that, for good cause, counsel for Defendants needed additional time to respond to the MSA.  
 Plaintiffs' landslide litigation tactics are unfairly prejudicial, and Plaintiffs' refusal to stipulate to Defendants'  
 reasonable requested extension of time is inconsistent with the California Attorney Guidelines of Civility and  
 Professionalism, established by the State Bar of California.

1 additional reasons necessitating modification expressed herein, the timing of the MSA filing  
2 provides good cause for the requested modification.

3 Fourth, the modification is necessary due to the pre-planned absence of a senior firm  
4 attorney, who is currently out-of-state on vacation. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶5). As mentioned  
5 within reason three, above, many attorneys and non-attorneys alike plan to take summer  
6 vacations with friends and family throughout the summer months. One of our firm's senior  
7 attorneys, who has played and continues to play an important role in this litigation, is currently  
8 out-of-state, and he is not scheduled to return until one day prior to the current due date of  
9 Defendants' Opposition to the MSA. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶5). Due to both his out-of-state  
10 status and his pre-planned vacation schedule, his ability to assist with said opposition prior to his  
11 return is extremely limited. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶5). Combined with the additional reasons  
12 necessitating modification expressed herein, the absence of this senior firm attorney provides  
13 good cause for the requested modification.

14 Fifth, the modification is necessary due to the unexpected illnesses and absences of  
15 multiple firm attorneys—including the firm's Lead Attorney on this matter. Throughout the past  
16 several weeks, a number of our attorneys have been unexpectedly absent for extended periods of  
17 time, due to illness, including the Lead Attorney on this matter. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶6).  
18 Additionally, due to these illnesses, a number of our attorneys have yet to fully return. (Hartman  
19 King Decl. at ¶6). These unexpected illnesses and absences have negatively impacted the firm's  
20 collective capacity. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶6). Combined with the additional reasons  
21 necessitating modification expressed herein, the unexpected illnesses and absences of these team  
22 members provide good cause for the requested modification.

23 Sixth, it is not possible for Defendants to prepare all the required supporting materials in  
24 advance of the current deadline due to circumstances beyond their control. For example,  
25 Defendants' expert needs to perform a site visit in advance of preparing a declaration in support  
26 of Defendants' Opposition and cannot do so in time to meet the current Opposition deadline due  
27  
28

1 to the intervening holiday, the expert's pre-planned travel, and the length of time necessary to  
2 clear the expert's admission into the secured prison facility. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶7).

3 Seventh, the modification is necessary because Defendants were unable to obtain from  
4 Plaintiffs a stipulation to Defendants' requested extension of the deadline to file their Opposition  
5 to Plaintiffs' MSA. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶10). On June 30, 2022, Defendants informed  
6 Plaintiffs that Defendants needed an extension to the deadline to file their Opposition to  
7 Plaintiffs' MSA up to and including August 1, 2022. In requesting Plaintiffs to stipulate to this  
8 requested extension, Defendants shared numerous good faith bases for their needed extension.  
9 Although Plaintiffs' unilateral decisions played a significant role in creating the scheduling  
10 issues necessitating this *ex parte* application, Plaintiffs refused to stipulate to Defendants'  
11 request to extend the opposition deadline to August 1. Combined with the additional reasons  
12 necessitating modification expressed herein, this provides good cause for the requested  
13 modification.

14 Eighth, the modification is necessary due to numerous other competing client  
15 commitments. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶8). Combined with the additional reasons necessitating  
16 modification expressed herein, this provides good cause for the requested modification.

17 **C. Defendants' Request To Modify The Briefing Schedule Of Plaintiffs' MSA Cannot**  
18 **Be Noticed On The Court's Motion Calendar Pursuant To Local Rule 230**

19 Pursuant to Eastern District Local Rule 230, motions must be heard on 35 days' notice.  
20 Given this Court's availability of hearing dates, the earliest this motion could be heard on regular  
21 notice is August 8, 2022, at 1:30 p.m. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶9). If it were to be heard in  
22 accordance with Local Rule 230, Defendants' motion would need to be filed on July 1, 2022, and  
23 Plaintiffs' Opposition Brief would be due on July 15, 2022, three days after the current due  
24 deadline for Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' MSA. (Hartman King Decl. at ¶9).

25 **D. Defendant's Request To Modify the Briefing Schedule Will Not Prejudice Plaintiffs**

26 Defendants' requested modified briefing schedule would allow Defendants to file their  
27 Opposition by August 1, and for Plaintiffs to file their Reply by August 11, 2022. Under the  
28

1 standard noticed motion period of 35 days, with a hearing date of August 22, Defendants' 2 Opposition deadline would have been August 1, 2022, and Plaintiffs' Reply deadline would have 3 been August 11, 2022, that is, the same dates as Defendants are requesting in this *ex parte* 4 application. Thus, Plaintiffs suffer no prejudice under Defendants' requested modified briefing 5 schedule, as Plaintiffs unilaterally selected the hearing date of August 22, and the briefing 6 deadlines calculated under the applicable procedural rules, had Plaintiffs filed the MSA with the 7 standard 35-days' notice period, would have provided deadlines of August 1 and August 11 for 8 the Opposition and Reply briefs. In other words, Plaintiffs would not be impacted materially by 9 the new briefing schedule, as they will have the same amount of time to file their Reply as they 10 do now (i.e., 10 days from the date the Opposition is filed), consistent with standard briefing 11 timeline requirements.

12 **III. CONCLUSION**

13 Based on the foregoing, Defendants respectfully request the Court grant this *ex parte* 14 application to modify the briefing schedule extending Defendants' deadline to file their 15 Opposition to and including August 1, 2022.

16 Dated: July 1, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

17 HARTMAN KING PC

18 

19 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
JENNIFER HARTMAN KING  
ALANNA LUNGREN  
J.R. PARKER  
ANDREYA WOO NAZAL

20 Attorneys for Defendants  
21 KATHLEEN ALLISON in her capacity as  
22 Secretary of THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT  
23 OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION;  
24 and PATRICK COVELLO, in his official capacity  
25 as Warden of California Department of Corrections  
and Rehabilitation Mule Creek State Prison